UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,008	07/31/2003	Avi Ashkenazi	39766-0100P1	8996

7590 05/26/2005

Ginger R. Dreger, Esq.
HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE, LLP
275 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
HADDAD, MAHER M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/633,008	ASHKENAZI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maher M. Haddad	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 February 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *3-6 and 16-39* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 7-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/20/04&4/18/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are pending.

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group VI, claims 1-2 and 6-15 drawn to a method of treating an inflammatory disorder with an immunoadhesin comprising SEQ ID NO: 32 and the species of rheumatoid arthritis filed on 2/10/05, is acknowledged.

Applicant's traversal is on the grounds that the the amino acids of SEQ ID NOs: 2 (huSTIgMA), 32 (full-length huSTIgMA), 33 (short form huSTIgMA) and 34 (muSTIgMA) are closely related. Applicant submits that SEQ ID NO: 2 is identical with SEQ ID NO: 32, but for 78 missing C-terminal amino acids. Further, Applicant submits that SEQ ID NO: 32 and SEQ ID NO: 33 are identical but for a deletion of amino acid positions 139-231 of SEQ ID NO: 33, and an L→H point mutation at position 138. Applicant further indicates that there is a high degree of sequence similarity between the human and murine sequences. This is not found persuasive because the specific immunoadhesin of STIgMA provides many possible combinations that are recognized divergent subject matter. STIgMA has two spliced variants, one containing an N-terminal IgV like domain and a C-terminal IgC2 like domain (SEQ ID NO: 32) and a spliced form lacking the C-terminal IgC2 domain (SEQ ID NO: 33). SEQ ID NO: 32 has 62% homology to SEQ ID NO: 33 with 89 amino acid mismatches in addition to the lack of the N. Further, SEQ ID NO: 32 has 80.5% sequence homology to SEQ ID NO:2 and 40% sequence homology to SEQ ID NO: 34. Therefore, the different immunoadhesin are distinct because their structures are different and are therefore capable of separate manufacture, use and sale. Therefore the methods of treating an inflammatory disorder with those immunoadhesins are distinct and independent, and searches of all groups would place an undue burden upon the examiner due to the distinct and divergent subject matter of each Group. Further, a prior art search also requires a literature search. It is an undue burden for the examiner to search more than one invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Claims 3-6, 16-39 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

4. Claims 1-2 and 7-15 are under examination as they read on a method of treating an inflammatory disorder with an immunoadhesin comprising the extracellular domain sequence of SEQ ID NO: 32 and the species of rheumatoid arthritis.

5. 7. The specification on page 1 should be amended to reflect the status of parent applications No. 09/380,138 and 09/953,499.

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention *to which the claims are directed.*

In addition, Applicant should avoid the use of novel in the title, as patents are presumed to be novel and unobvious.

7. Applicant's IDS, filed 2/20/04 and 4/18/05, is acknowledged.

8. Figures 25-26 appear to have discrepancy between the labels on the figures and the brief description of the drawings. Figure 25 shows four different cell types: Colon Macs, Kupffer cells, Adrenal Macs and Hofbauer cells. However, the brief description of the drawings of figure 25 discloses only "activated" alveolar macrophages (Macs) and Kupffer cells. Similarly, Figure 26 shows Synovial cells, however, the brief description of the drawings of figure 26 discloses only placental Hofbauer (placental macrophage) cells. Further, the brief description of the drawings indicates that figures 25 and 26 show in situ hybridization, however, the Examiner could not find any in situ graphs. It appears that Figures 25 and 26 show only immunohistochemistry graphs. Clarification/Correction is required.

9. Claims 7-11 are objected to because claim 7 depends form non-elected claim 4.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The "antagonist" recited in claim 7 has no antecedent basis in non-elected base claim 4. Non-elected base claim 4 only recites antibody. It appears that claim 7 should depend from claim 2.

12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. Claims 1-2 and 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating any "inflammatory disorder" in a mammal, said method comprising administering to said mammal a therapeutically effective amount of "an antagonist" of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide in claim 1, wherein said native sequence STIgMA polypeptide is SEQ ID NO: 32 in claim 2, wherein said antagonist is an "immunoadhesin" in claim 7, wherein said immunoadhesin comprises a "STIgMA extracellular domain sequence fused to an immunoglobulin constant region sequence" in claim 8, wherein said extracellular domain sequence is "essentially free of

transmembrane domain sequences" in claim 9, wherein said immunoglobulin is an IgG in claim 10, wherein said IgG is IgG1 or IgG3 in claim 11, wherein the inflammatory disorder is rheumatoid arthritis in claims 11 and 12, wherein said mammal is human in claims 14 and 15. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and or use the invention commensurate in scope with this claim.

The specification disclosure does not enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention without an undue amount of experimentation.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required to practice the claimed invention are summarized *In re Wands* (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to this rejection are the scope of the claim, the amount of direction or guidance provided, the lack of sufficient working examples, the unpredictability in the art and the amount of experimentation required to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

The claimed novel macrophage associated receptor (STIgMA) is acknowledged by the Applicants to involve in chronic inflammation (see examples 24 and 25 of the specification) based on the expression of STIgMA in inflamed synovium (see page 11, 87¶). No single effect of the disclosed STIgMA is ascribed to the claimed protein. It appears that the Fc-extracellular domain of native STIgMA polypeptide acts an antagonist of the native sequence of STIgMA polypeptide. Walker MG in Biochimica et Biophysica Acta 1574 (2002) 387-390 teaches that in electronic screening of libraries, high expression of STIgMA mRNA (Z39Ig) was found in the synovium of patients with rheumatoid arthritis when compared its expression to the expression patterns of genes with known functions (see abstract and page 387, 1st paragraph). Importantly, Walker teaches that the Z39Ig gene has no known function. However, the Walker reference concludes that better understanding of Z39Ig (STIgMA) gene may help us mediate the adverse effects of complement and activated macrophages in rheumatoid arthritis (see page 389 1st col., 4th paragraph in particular). Further, it is noted that mRNA STIgMA abundance correlates with the protein expression using polyclonal antibody 6F1 (see page 118, 533¶). However, no *in vitro* or *in vivo* exemplification in the specification is drawn to the efficacy of the claimed antagonists of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide including an immunoadhesin for the treatment of any inflammatory disorders. A correlation between the levels of STIgMA in activated macrophages and synovocytes in inflamed joints of mice with collagen induced arthritis (see pages 120-121 under Example 25) may provide an indication that particular compounds/compositions are appropriate to target for *further experimental consideration*. Applicant's disclosure does not appear to have provided the skilled artisan with sufficient guidance and support as how to extrapolate the development of effective *in vivo* human therapeutic methods, commensurate in scope with the claimed invention.

On the basis of the disclosed correlation of the level of STIgMA mRNA expression in inflamed synovium observation alone (see page 11, 87¶ and page 119, 540¶), applicant concludes that the scope of the STIgMA polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 32 antagonist such as immunoadhesin

encompassed by the claimed invention can have biological activity to treat inflammatory disorders including rheumatoid arthritis and be provided as pharmaceutical compositions to subjects including human to effectively treat inflammatory disorders including rheumatoid arthritis.

Further, Applicant has not provided sufficient biochemical information that distinctly identifies "an antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide", "an inflammatory disorder", "an immunoadhesin", "a STIgMA extracellular domain sequence fused to an immunoglobulin constant region sequence" and "extracellular domain sequence is essentially free of transmembrane domain sequences" other than SEQ ID Nos:2, 32-34 without the N-terminal signal sequence and transmembrane domain fused to Fc of either IgG1 or IgG3. While any antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA may have some notion of the activity of the "inhibitory agent", claiming biochemical molecules by such properties fails to provide sufficient guidance and direction as to how the skilled artisan can make such antagonists, commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. The specification fails to provide any guidance on how to make any antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide that can be used to treat an inflammatory disorder.

In addition, Kahan states that "no in vitro immune assay predicts or correlates with in vivo immunosuppressive efficacy; hence, there is no surrogate immune parameter as a basis of immunosuppressive efficacy and/or for dose extrapolation from in vitro systems to in vivo conditions" (Curr. Opin. Immuno. 4:553:560, 1992; see entire document, particularly page 558, column 2) making the in vivo efficacy of untested a native sequence of STIgMA polypeptide antagonist including immunoadhesin unpredictable. *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18 indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute.

Since no *in vitro* or *in vivo* studies were used as model system to treat an inflammatory disorder including rheumatoid arthritis, it is not clear that reliance on the gene expression data of STIgMA gene accurately reflects the relative mammal efficacy of the claimed therapeutic strategy. The specification does not adequately teach how to effectively treat an inflammatory disorder including RA or reach any therapeutic endpoint in mammals by administrating the therapeutic composition of immunoadhesin. The specification does not teach how to extrapolate data obtained from the gene expression profile studies to the development of effective in vivo mammalian therapeutic treatment, commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. Therefore, it is not clear that the skilled artisan could predict the efficacy of the antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide encompassed by the claimed invention. There must be a rigorous correlation of biological activity between the disclosed differential gene expression of STIgMA and an *in vivo* effectiveness to establish a method of treatment of an inflammatory disorder including RA. The specification does not provide sufficient teaching as to how it can be assessed that treatment of an inflammatory disorder including RA is achieved after the administration of the therapeutic composition of the invention.

Substantiating evidence may be in the form of animal tests, which constitute recognized screening procedures with clear relevance to efficacy in humans. See Ex parte Krepelka, 231 USPQ 746 (Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences 1986) and cases cited therein. Ex parte Maas, 9 USPQ2d 1746.

Although, the specification describes differential gene expression of STIgMA experiments, there is no correlation on this record between the gene expression experiments and a method of treatment of inflammatory disorders including RA in currently available form for humans or animals. It is not enough to rely on in vitro studies where, as here, a person having ordinary skill in the art has no basis for perceiving those studies as constituting recognized screening procedures with clear relevance to efficacy in humans or animals (emphasis added). Ex parte Maas, 9 USPQ2d 1746.

Reasonable correlation must exist between the scope of the claims and scope of the enablement set forth. In view on the quantity of experimentation necessary the limited working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims, it would take undue trials and errors to practice the claimed invention.

14. Claims 1-2 and 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant is in possession of the amino acid molecules of SEQ ID NO: 2 and 32-34, antibodies against SEQ ID NO: 2 or 32-34, and immunoadhesins comprising the extracellular domain sequence of SEQ ID NOs: 2 or 32-34 fused to Fc region of IgG1 or IgG3.

Applicant is not in possession of a method of treating any "inflammatory disorder" in a mammal, said method comprising administering to said mammal a therapeutically effective amount of "an antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide" in claim 1, wherein said native sequence STIgMA polypeptide is SEQ ID NO: 32 in claim 2, wherein said antagonist is an "immunoadhesin" in claim 7, wherein said immunoadhesin comprises a "STIgMA extracellular domain sequence fused to an immunoglobulin constant region sequence" in claim 8, wherein said extracellular domain sequence is "essentially free of transmembrane domain sequences" in claim 9, wherein said immunoglobulin is an IgG in claim 10, wherein said IgG is IgG1 or IgG3 in claim 11, wherein the inflammatory disorder is rheumatoid arthritis in claims 11 and 12, wherein said mammal is human in claims 14 and 15.

Neither the exemplary embodiments nor the specification's general method appears to describe structural features, in structural terms, that are common to the genus. That is, the specification provides neither a representative number of species (antagonists of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide, an immunoadhesin, a STIgMA extracellular domain sequence, an immunoglobulin constant region sequence) to describe the claimed genus, nor does it provide a description of structural features that are common to species (antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA

polypeptide). The specification provides no structural description of antagonist of a native STIgMA polypeptide other than the amino acid molecules of SEQ ID NO: 2 and 32-34, antibodies against SEQ ID NO: 2 or 32-34, and immunoadhesins comprising the extracellular domain sequence of SEQ ID NOs: 2 or 32-34 fused to Fc region of IgG1 or IgG3; in essence, the specification simply directs those skilled in the art to go figure out for themselves what the claimed antagonists/immunoadhesin of a native STIgMA polypeptide looks like. The specification's disclosure is inadequate to describe the claimed genus of antagonists/immunoadhesin.

Applicant has disclosed only amino acid of SEQ ID NOs: 2 and 32-34 an aminoadhesin thereof and antibodies to SEQ ID NOs: 2 or 32-34; therefore, the skilled artisan cannot envision all the contemplated antagonist/immunoadhesion sequence possibilities recited in the instant claims. Consequently, conception cannot be achieved until a representative description of the structural and functional properties of the claimed invention has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC1993). The Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Application Under the 35 U.S.C.112, ¶ 1"Written Description" Requirement make clear that the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the genus (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 20001, see especially page 1106 3rd column).

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.). Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Applicant is directed to the final Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

15. Claim 1 is directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-8 of commonly assigned U.S Application No. 10/265,542. Specifically, both applications are drawn to the same method of treating an inflammatory disorder in a mammal, said method comprising administering to said mammal a therapeutically effective amount of an antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide of PRO362. An antibody to PRO362 is considered an antagonist.

Therefore, they are not patentably distinct.

16. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned U.S Application No. 10/265,542, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

17. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 10/265,542. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications are drawn to the same method of treating an inflammatory disorder in a mammal, said method comprising administering to said mammal a therapeutically effective amount of an antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide of PRO362 (i.e., long huSTIgMA of SEQ ID NO: 2). An antibody to PRO362 is considered an antagonist. Therefore, they are not patentably distinct.

18. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over copending Application No. 10/265,542 which has a common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the copending application, it would constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) if published or patented. This provisional rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is based upon a presumption of future publication or patenting of the conflicting application. Both applications are drawn to the same method of treating an inflammatory disorder in a mammal, said method comprising administering to said mammal a therapeutically effective amount of an antagonist of a native sequence STIgMA polypeptide of PRO362 (i.e., long huSTIgMA of SEQ ID NO: 2). An antibody to PRO362 is considered an antagonist. Therefore, they are not patentably distinct.

This provisional rejection might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by a showing of a date of invention for the instant application prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the copending application under 37 CFR 1.131. This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the copending application is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

19. No claim is allowed.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maher Haddad whose telephone number is (571) 272-0845. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May13, 2005

Maher Haddad

Maher Haddad, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600